



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/910,970 | 07/20/2001 | David H. Hanes | 10012397-1 | 2563 |

7590 08/26/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

VENT, JAMIE J

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2616 | 13 |

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MAILED

AUG 26 2004

Technology Center 2600



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/910,970

Filing Date: July 20, 2001

Appellant(s): HANES, DAVID H.

James L. Baudino
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed June 7, 2004.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is incorrect. A correct statement of the status of the claims is as follows:

Claim 36-40 been canceled.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims in group 1, 2, 3, and 4 stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

Examiner agrees with grouping of claims.

(8) ClaimsAppealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is incorrect because claims 36-40 have been cancelled.

(9) Prior Art of Record

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| 5,282,097 | <i>Choi et al</i> | 01-1994 |
| 6,100,941 | <i>Dimitrova et al</i> | 08-2000 |
| 5,019,899 | <i>Boles et al</i> | 05-1991 |

(10) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim 1-7, 9-13, 15-19, 22-29, 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Dettmer et al (US 5,812,732). Claims 8, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dettmer et al (US 5,812,732) in view of Nafeh (US 5,343,251). This rejection is set forth in a prior Office Action, mailed on February 25, 2004.

(11) *Response to Argument*

On Pages 5-7 of the Appeal Brief appellant argues that the Examiner has failed to point out any teaching, suggestion or motivation in Dettmer et al (US 5,812,732) which "analyzes a plurality of video frames, the plurality of video frames comprising recorded data content and unrecorded data content" as disclosed in Claims 1, 9, and 15. The Examiner notes that Dettmer et al discloses a system which video frames are analyzed to determine undesired programs (commercials) and desired programs. As seen in Figure 5b and described in Column 8 Lines 38-51 the system analyzes the data content into undesired/commercial (step 518) or desired program (step 521). Furthermore, the desired program is recorded on the program device (523) and the undesired/commercial program becomes unrecorded by being sent to the commercial device (520). Thereby making the undesired programs (commercials) the unrecorded content and the desired programs the recorded data content. Furthermore, it is further stated in the applicant's specification on page 2 lines 8-10 "The plurality of video frames

comprise recorded video data and undesired data". Therefore, it is seen that the Dettmer et al reference meets the limitations of recorded and unrecorded content.

*JTG
8/23/04*

On Pages 7-9 of the Appeal Brief ^{appellant} argues that the Examiner has failed to point out any teaching, suggestion or motivation in Dettmer et al (US 5,812,732) which has "border detection module; and logic residing on the module, the logic adapted to compare at least two video frames of the video data, the logic adapted to identify at least one of the two video frames as a border between unrecorded data content of the video data and recorded data content of the video data if pixel values of at least one of the two video frames corresponds substantially to a particular color" as disclosed in Claims 23 and 29. The examiner notes the border detection module (Figure 1 element 101) detecting the border of undesired (commercial) programs and sending desired material to the recording unit as seen in Figure 2 and further described in Column 5 Lines 30-60. It is further stated in Column 12 Lines 38-44 distinguishes undesired and desired programs by determining color variances between images using pixel values as stated in Column 3 Lines 7-14. Therefore, it is seen that Dettmer et al reference meets the limitations of having a border detection module, which detects undesired and desired materials based on pixel values based on at least one of the two video frames of the data segment.

On Pages 10-11 of the Appeal Brief appellant argues that the Examiner has failed to point out any teaching, suggestion, or motivation in Dettmer et al (US 5,812,732) in view of Nafeh (US 5,343,251) for "determining from the motion vectors the at least one frame of unrecorded data content" and "analyzing motion compensation

vectors to determine the amount of motion" as disclosed in Claims 8, 14, 20, and 30. Dettmer et al discloses a histogram of the brightness distribution of an image that is calculated from the use of vectors; however, does not disclose the vectors to be motion vectors. Nafeh discloses the use of motion vectors through the analyzing of vectors (Column 4 Lines 45-48 and Column 5 Lines 6-7) that identify vectors and change in vectors through detectors and amplifiers that show changes and classify by indicator number in the range of +1 and -1. It is determined from the vectors what data content is undesired as described in Column 5 Lines 35-38 and Column 6 Lines 25-26 which describes the classification of the video stream and vectors for determining desired and undesired segments. Thereby, analyzing the motion compensation of the vectors to determine the motion of each segment. Therefore, it is seen that Dettmer et al in view of Nafeh meets the limitation of using motion vectors in determining undesired and desired data content.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Jamie Vent

Jamie Vent
August 23, 2004

Conferees
Thai Tran
Vincent Boccio

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Thai Tran
THAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Huu Nguyen
HUU NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER